

**RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER****AUG 18 2005****IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re the application of:

Murali Krishna Akkapeddi, et al

Docket: H0003997 (4300)

Serial Number: 10/617,109

Group Art Unit: 1772

Filed: July 10, 2003

Examiner: Christopher F. Bruenjes

For: DELAMINATION-RESISTANT, BARRIER POLYAMIDE  
COMPOSITIONS FOR 3-LAYER PET BEVERAGE BOTTLES**FAX COVER SHEET**TO: Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

FAX NO.: (571) 273-8300

FROM: Richard S. Roberts  
Reg. No. 27941  
P.O. Box 484  
Princeton, New Jersey 08542  
(609) 921-3500

DATE: August 18, 2005

KINDLY DIRECT THIS COMMUNICATION TO:

EXAMINER : Christopher F. Bruenjes  
GROUP : 1772

NO. OF PAGES SENT INCLUDING THIS COVER SHEET: 3

INCLUDED: RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT and FAX COVER  
SHEET

If all pages are not received, please call (609) 921-3500.

**RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

AUG 18 2005

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re the application of:

Murali Krishna Akkapeddi, et al

Docket: H0003997 (4300)

Serial Number: 10/617,109

Group Art Unit: 1772

Filed: July 10, 2003

Examiner: Christopher F. Bruenjes

For: DELAMINATION-RESISTANT, BARRIER POLYAMIDE  
COMPOSITIONS FOR 3-LAYER PET BEVERAGE BOTTLES**RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT**Commissioner For Patents  
P.O.Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

Sir:

In response to the Office Action mailed August 5, 2005, applicant makes the following election in response to the restriction requirement.

**REMARKS**

The Examiner has subjected this application to restriction under 35 U.S.C. 121. The Examiner has formed three groups of claims, Group I for claims 1-23 drawn to a polyamide composition, Group II drawn to a multiplayer film, and Group III for claims 39-42 drawn to a process for making a multilayered article. The Examiner has asserted that these groups of claims represent distinct inventions and may properly be restricted. Applicants hereby provisionally elect claim Group I directed to claims 1-23 for examination. However, the restriction requirement is traversed. It should be noted, the Commissioner may statutorily require the election of inventions "If two or more independent and distinct inventions are claimed in one application." In the instant case the Examiner is alleging that the inventions of groups one and two are distinct, although absolutely no showing of such distinctness has been made.